DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 637 EA 016 975

AUTHOR Adkins, Deberie Gomez; And Others
TITLE Implementation and Monitoring School Improvement Plans: Getting Everyone Involved.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; *Program Validation; Supervisory Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Dallas Independent School District TX

ABSTRACT

Schools of the Dallas Independent School District have developed procedures to implement and monitor school improvement measures. The district aims to improve student achievement in four areas: functional literacy, mathematics, reading, and basic language arts. Participants in instructional improvement include teachers, principals, administrators, specialists, and other personnel. Each school's plan includes an internal monitoring process that is documented to facilitate verification by external monitors, who are coordinated by subdistrict administrators. External monitoring teams include instructional specialists, special education personnel, and an assistant superintendent. Although monitoring processes vary, all monitors use the same forms. Results of monitoring from the 1982-83 school year suggest a need for agreement on the following: minimum number of teachers each monitor should observe, minimum time a monitor should remain in a classroom, and priority of monitoring. Measures were implemented to address each of these needs for the following school year. Monitoring data, examples of instructional strategies, internal monitoring procedures, and monitoring forms are included. (FWR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Deberie Gomez Adkins TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Implementation and Monitoring School Improvement Plans: Getting Everyone Involved

Deberie Gomez Adkins, Robert P. Grobe, and Jerrilyn V. Andrews

Dallas Independent School District

ED247637

For the past five years, the schools of the Dallas Independent School District (DISD) have been required to develop and implement annual school improvement plans which consist of instructional strategies designed to increase achievement in areas of weakness identified by annual needs assessments. This requirement stems from the DISD's efforts to comply with the Texas Education Agency's Principles, Standards, and Procedures for the Accreditation of School Districts and is supported by the February 1, 1982, Court Order for desegregation. Individual school improvement planning is by no means unique to the DISD in the 1980's when national attention is focused on accountability and improving student achievement. What may be somewhat unique to the DISD at this time is the almost total involvement of all levels of staff in the implementation and the monitoring of the school improvement plans. While the plans have always been developed by principals and their faculties with technical and other assistance provided by administrative departments, the evolution of total participation in implementing and monitoring the plans occurred over the five-year accreditation cycle and can be attributed to substantial changes in the District's administrative structure and in the District's assessment system.

EA 016 975

The purposes of this paper are to: (1) briefly describe involvement of DISD staff in the implementation of school improvement plans, (2) briefly describe the monitoring process, and (3) present data summarizing the actual implementation and monitoring during the 1982-83 school year.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 1984

Implementation of School Improvement Plans

As described earlier, the school improvement plans in the DISD consist of instructional strategies or processes. Schools must address the District's four priority goals which are: (1) Functional Literacy, (2) Mathematics, (3) Reading, and (4) Basic Language Arts. Obviously, implementation becomes a primary responsibility of the classroom teachers, media specialists, Chapter I teachers, and all the personnel directly involved with actual classroom instruction. The principal is involved to the extent that he/she actually performs some of the instruction and/or demonstrates the instructional process to his/her teachers. Furthermore, if some or all of the teachers require further staff development in order to implement the instructional strategies, subdistrict administrators and specialists, Department of Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) directors and specialists, and/or Department of Research and Evaluation (R&E) personnel are called upon to assist the teachers. A sample of an instructional strategy for Goal 3, Basic Language Arts, is included in Appendix A.

The Monitoring Process

Monitoring the implementation of the school improvement plans also begins at the campus level. An internal monitoring process must be written into the plan. There is some flexibility in that the school may decide whether or not to use teachers as classroom monitors. Principals and other school administrators definitely monitor classrooms. Frequently, grade-level team leaders or department chairpersons are appointed who monitor implementation by reviewing their peers' lesson plans or holding discussion meetings. Schools often use a self-checklist approach to monitoring. In all cases, the internal monitoring process

must be well documented because the external monitors verify that the internal monitoring is taking place. Appendix B provides an example or prototype for an internal monitoring procedure.

External monitoring is coordinated by subdistrict administrators. There are three regular subdistricts in the DISD with an assistant superintendent and four administrators assigned to each. In addition there is a Magnet School Subdistrict with an assistant superintendent and one administrator. Each school in the District is monitored twice per year by teams composed of a minimum of one subdistrict administrator, one person from C&I, and one person from R&E. Some teams also include subdistrict instructional specialists, special education personnel, and an assistant superintendent. In theory, almost every teacher in the DISD should receive one classroom visit by an external monitor during the school year. That is accomplished by having the monitoring team visit half of the teachers in a given building during the fall round of monitoring and half of the teachers during the spring round of visits. Only in the case of some of the exceptionally large high schools should this pattern fail to occur. In practice, as the results which follow will show, the monitoring process during the 1982-83 school year fell short of the implied goal of monitoring all teachers.

During the 1982-83 school year, variations in the actual process of monitoring were relatively extensive. Some administrators chose to set up a fixed schedule of visits and ask all monitoring team members to monitor together on the appointed date. Other administrators allowed each monitor to visit the set of schools according to their own schedule. Regardless of the monitoring schedule, all monitors used the same forms.

There are three forms used in the monitoring process. These forms are revised annually by R&E personnel with input from the school-level personnel, subdistrict personnel, and staff from C&I. A classroom observation form is used by each monitor to record each classroom visit. The monitor then aggregates information from these forms on a school monitoring report form. At this point, the monitor debriefs with the principal pointing out the strengths, successes, weaknesses, and problems noted in individual classrooms and in the building in general. The subdistrict administrator collects the school monitoring report forms from each monitor and again aggregates the data to complete a team report form. The team report form is reviewed and signed by each monitor and by the principal. It is then forwarded to the office of the General Superintendent and to the office of Desegregation Monitoring. Copies of the 1982-83 monitoring forms are included as Appendix C of this paper. Note that each form is two-sided.

Results of 1982-83 Monitoring

Having described the level of proposed involvement in the implementation and monitoring processes in the previous sections, this section will illuminate what actually happened during the 1982-83 school year. Team monitoring reports for each school from the fall visit and from the spring visit were analyzed to produce the data which follow.

Each school was monitored twice for implementation of the school improvement plan. Every school except two was monitored once after the plan had been approved but before winter vacation; the remaining two schools were monitored in early January. All schools were monitored a second time before the end of April. Monitoring teams were usually

composed of three people, a subdistrict administrator, a C&I representative and an R&E staff member. Some teams also included subdistrict instructional specialists, special education personnel and, in the magnets and one subdistrict, the assistant superintendent.

In some cases the monitoring teams traveled together to visit a school and in other cases team members went individually to each school. Some spring monitoring visits were delayed, largely as a result of budget hearings, but all the subdistrict administrators except one did complete their visits. C&I personnel missed a few schools. All visits scheduled for R&E personnel were completed.

Subdistrict, C&I, and R&E staff were to receive training on monitoring and the completion of monitoring forms prior to conducting any monitoring visits. A majority of those invited participated in the September 1982 training session. Three sets of forms were explained at that time. The first was the individual classroom observation form. One of these was to be completed by each monitor for each classroom observed. After a monitor had completed all assigned observations in a school, a school monitoring report form was to be used to summarize the monitor's findings. Finally the team members pooled their observations to produce one completed school improvement monitoring team report. These completed forms were signed by the monitors and by the school principal before being submitted to the General Superintendent. A deadline was set by which completed forms were due in the Superintendent's office. The deadlines were met.

The school improvement plan monitoring form for 1982-83 for elementary schools is presented in Figure 1. The middle and high school versions are identical except that the appropriate grades are listed.

Combined total of teachers visited without repetition

Grade Level	Number	Language Arts	Math	Reading	Social Studies	Science	Others
K	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
1	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

1. In how many of the classes observed did you see:

   (a) FIND _____ (c) DEMONSTRATE _____ (e) APPLY _____

   (b) TELL _____ (d) GUIDED PRACTICE _____ (f) EVALUATE _____

2. There was evidence of direct instruction:

   _____ in all classes in _____ of _____ classes.

3. Documentation of TEA strategies being implemented was found:

   _____ in all classes in _____ of _____ classes.

4. Documentation that District-wide Thrust 2 (use of total allocated instruction time) was being implemented was found:

   _____ in all classes in _____ of _____ classes.

5. Lesson plans contained the following common factors:

   _____ in all classes in _____ of _____ classes.

6. Does this school have a provision for evaluating the strategies and if so, how?

7. What major points were made to the principal concerning the visit when monitor(s) debriefed?

8. Was there documentation that District-wide Thrust 1 (increase teacher attendance) was being implemented?

   _____ Yes _____ No

9. Comments, suggestions, commendations, recommendations, actions required:

Figure 1. Items contained on the 1982-83 School Improvement Plan Monitoring Team Report

Space was provided for longer answers to items 5, 6, 7, and 9. The individual classroom monitoring form had originally contained a checklist of factors for item 5; the checklist was removed after the monitors' training session. It's removal rendered the item non-quantifiable. Monitors did their best to respond to the item but the variety of responses precluded summarization. Monitors also found it difficult to place multi-grade classes, Chapter I, media center, and special education observations on the grade-by-subject-matter grid. As a result of the varying ways in which that was done, data can not be presented by subject. Some teams wrote all their comments, recommendations, etc. under item 7, some under item 9, and some under both. As a result the two items have been combined for presentation here. The fall monitoring reports from the magnet high schools did not include numbers in response to item 1; the magnets were therefore excluded when that item was tabulated.

Table 1 shows the number of classrooms that were monitored in each subdistrict during each round of monitoring visits. Across the District over 5,400 classes were monitored during the 1982-83 school year. This is approximately the same number that were monitored during the 1981-82 school year. The large variation in number of classes observed, particularly at the secondary level, would seem to indicate that guidelines are needed concerning the minimum number of classes to be observed at each school. In some of the smaller schools each classroom was observed during both the fall and spring visits. In many schools half the classrooms were monitored in the fall and half in the spring. However, some schools received minimal monitoring and only a relatively small percent of the faculty was observed on the combined visits.

Table 1

Number of Classrooms Monitored
by Grade Configuration and Subdistrict

Grade Configuration		Subdistrict I	II	III	Magnet HS	Total
K-6	Fall	532	732	585	-	1849
	Spring	448	713	564	-	1725
7-8	Fall	82	140	110	-	332
	Spring	79	109	171	-	359
9-12	Fall	89	141	237	217	684
	Spring	74	117	232	69	492
All Grades	Fall	703	1013	932	217	2865
	Spring	601	939	967	69	2576
Grand Total		1304	1952	1899	286	5441

Elementary Schools. Monitoring reports showed that 1,849 elementary classrooms were monitored during fall visits and 1,725 were monitored in the spring. Table 2 presents, by subdistrict, the percentage of classrooms in which monitors reported observing each of the six steps to effective instruction, direct instruction, use of all allocated instructional time, and documentation that TEA School Improvement Plan (SIP) strategies were being implemented. Given the length of time a typical monitor can spend in any one classroom, one would not expect to see all six steps in every classroom nor can one establish an "acceptable"level for each step. It is apparent from Table 2 that some large differences were found among the subdistricts. For example, "find," "tell," and "evaluation" were reported in Subdistrict I at considerably higher rates than was true in Subdistricts II and III while "application" was reported relatively less often in Subdistrict III than in the other two subdistricts. The total percentages for District elementary schools were remarkably similiar fall and spring.

Subdistrict II reported substantially lower percentages for direct instruction, use of allocated instructional time, and implementation of TEA strategies than the other two subdistricts. Unfortunately, these data were apparently not recorded for 110-169 Subdistrict II classrooms in the fall; another Subdistrict II administrator required observation of the TEA strategies being done rather than observation and/or written documentation which was the criterion elsewhere in the District. As a result of these two problems, one cannot be sure if the observed differences between subdistrict percentages represent real differences in

Table 2

Percent of K-6 Classrooms in Which the Six Steps, Direct Instruction, Good Use of Time, and Implementation of TEA Strategies Were Reportedly Observed in Each Subdistrict

	Subdistrict							
	I		II		III		Total	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Find	52	62	40	39	40	47	44	48
Tell	62	67	53	48	57	58	57	56
Demonstrate	68	76	64	69	74	76	68	73
Guided Practice	75	84	68	72	70	71	71	75
Application	41	39	37	41	31	27	36	37
Evaluation	37	42	27	22	26	30	29	30
Direct Instruction	81	81	72 (n = 622)[a]	73	84	83	79 (n = 1729)[a]	78
Use of Time	89	88	72 (n = 563)[b]	77	86	80	83 (n = 1727)[b]	81
TEA Strategies	79	84	58[d] (n = 620)[c]	66[d]	87	74	74 (n = 1680)[c]	74
N	532	448	732	713	585	564	1849	1725

[a]Not recorded in 110 classes
[b]Not recorded in 169 classes
[c]Not recorded in 112 classes
[d]One of the three administrators required observation of the strategy being done rather than observation and/or written documentation.

teacher behavior or simply differences in recording practices. As was true with the six steps, the overall District percentages are very consistent from fall to spring.

Schools reported evaluating the implementation of their SIP strategies in a number of ways. The most often mentioned were (in order) (a) classroom observation by school administrators, (b) review of lesson plans by school administrators, (c) grade, department, team or staff meetings, (d) teacher-completed checklists, and (e) use of Assessment of Baseline Curriculum (ABC) or other tests. Virtually all schools documented their efforts to improve teacher attendance.

All monitoring reports included comments, suggestions, commendations and/or recommendations. The comments tended to be relatively specific. Table 3 contains a summary of the written comments. It is clear that areas of strength in some schools were areas of weakness in others. No one area emerges as a District-wide problem; rather many schools have specific areas in which they need to improve. Areas frequently cited as needing improvement in elementary schools were lesson plans, direct teaching, large group/whole class instruction, and implementation of SIP. In addition specific teachers in need of assistance were discussed with the principal and many specific suggestions to improve a particular school were made. Areas that were cited as strengths include direct teaching, time on task, implementation of SIP, instructional displays, school climate, and classroom management. Numerous programs or teachers received specific commendations and a number of spring reports mentioned that improvement was evident since the fall monitoring visit.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of Monitors' Written Comments by Grade Configuration and Time of Visit

Comment	Subdistrict I		Subdistrict II		Subdistrict III		Total	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Lesson plans generally good	38	24	7	7	4	8	49	39
Lesson plans need improvement	46	60	14	8	17	13	77	81
Good direct teaching	75	70	11	10	12	14	98	94
Need more direct teaching/staff dev. needed	47	26	3	5	5	8	55	39
Good use of 6 steps	12	10	1	1	0	5	13	16
Improve use of 6 steps	3	17	7	3	0	6	10	26
Good time on task	31	37	8	8	8	5	47	50
Time on task needs improvement	4	10	4	2	7	9	15	21
Good whole class/ large group instruction	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	13
Need more large group/ whole class instruction	22	23	0	0	0	0	22	23
Instruction is on level	4	5	0	0	0	0	4	5
Off level instruction observed/staff dev. needed	7	11	0	0	0	0	7	11
Good implementation of SIP	26	24	21	11	14	7	61	42
Implementation of SIP needs improvement	28	17	13	3	11	3	52	23

Table 3 (Continued)

Frequency Distribution of Monitors' Written Comments by Grade Configuration and Time of Visit

Comment	Subdistrict I Fall	Subdistrict I Spring	Subdistrict II Fall	Subdistrict II Spring	Subdistrict III Fall	Subdistrict III Spring	Total Fall	Total Spring
Good internal monitoring system	2	2	2	0	2	0	6	2
Internal monitoring system needs improvement	8	1	3	2	3	2	14	5
Good instructional displays/student work	13	26	6	12	2	3	21	41
Need more instructional displays/student work	1	8	0	2	1	8	2	18
School climate is good	36	58	7	1	14	5	57	64
School climate needs improvement	9	3	0	0	0	1	9	4
Building clean and attractive	10	22	3	3	0	3	13	28
Class/hall management are good	30	37	0	4	4	6	34	47
Class/hall management need improvement	15	15	4	5	7	5	26	25
Principal good instructional leader	19	10	5	2	5	2	29	14
Commendation for specific programs/teachers	16	83	0	12	0	22	28	105
Specific suggestions for helping certain weak teachers	30	39	4	13	2	8	36	60
Misc - specific suggestions/improvements needed	48	59	6	9	8	10	62	78
Improvement since 1st visit		28		6		3		37

Middle Schools. Monitors reported observing in 332 middle school classrooms during fall visits and 359 classrooms during the spring visits. Table 4 presents, by subdistrict, the percentage of classrooms in which monitors reported observing each of the six steps to effective instruction, direct instruction, use of all allocated instructional time and documentation that TEA (SIP) strategies were being implemented. The reader is reminded that, given the time a typical monitor spends in a classroom, one would not expect to observe all six steps. Some substantial subdistrict differences are apparent in Table 4. Specifically, with the exception of "guided practice" in the spring, Subdistrict I always reported a higher percentage on each of the six steps than did either of the other subdistricts as well as reporting higher percentages of direct instruction, good use of allocated instruction time, and implementation of TEA (SIP) strategies. It cannot be determined if these differences are real, a function of the particular monitors in each subdistrict and/or a function of the fact that substantially fewer classrooms were observed in Subdistrict I. The total percentages for District middle schools show slight increases from fall to spring in "demonstrate," direct instruction and use of allocated instruction time and decreases in the other areas. Implementation of TEA (SIP) strategies showed the largest decline.

Middle schools reported using several techniques to evaluate their TEA (SIP) strategies and insure that they were being implemented. The most frequently mentioned were administrative review of lesson plans and classroom observations by school administrators. Department and faculty

Table 4

Percent of Middle School Classrooms in Which the Six Steps, Direct Instruction, Good Use of Time, and Implementation of TEA Strategies Were Reportedly Observed in Each Subdistrict

	Subdistrict						Total	
	I		II		III			
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Find	62	61	35	35	36	26	42	37
Tell	78	73	51	50	50	36	57	49
Demonstrate	78	76	56	70	71	62	66	68
Guided Practice	93	75	60	82	71	60	72	70
Application	57	52	36	51	53	30	47	42
Evaluation	45	42	26	40	37	18	35	30
Direct Instruction	92	89	79	79	76	81	81	83
Use of Time	94	95	80	83	77	82	83	86
TEA Strategies	94	85	75	58	85	75	83	72
N	82	79	140	109	110	171	332	359

meetings were mentioned several times; a number of other techniques were mentioned by individual schools. All schools apparently had some documentation of their efforts to improve teacher attendance.

High Schools. Table 1 shows that 684 high school classrooms were monitored in the fall and 492 classrooms in the spring. The large decrease in the number of classrooms monitored is primarily the result of the change in the number of classrooms monitored in the magnet high schools. There the monitoring team attempted to monitor all teachers in the fall and only a sample in the spring. The differences among subdistricts in the number of classrooms monitored are substantial; in the spring over three times as many classrooms in Subdistrict III were monitored than were monitored in Subdistrict I.

Table 5 presents, by subdistrict, the percentage of classrooms in which monitors reported observing each of the six steps to effective instruction, direct instruction, use of all allocated instructional time, and documentation that TEA (SIP) strategies were being implemented. The reader is reminded that in the fall the magnet monitoring team did not report numbers of classrooms in which the six steps were observed although they did report numbers for direct instruction, use of instructional time, and implementation of strategies. Large differences among subdistricts are apparent in the percent of classrooms in which each of the six steps to effective instruction was observed. With the sole exception of "demonstrate" in the spring, Subdistrict I always reported the highest percentages. Like the middle school differences, these cannot be clearly interpreted.

Table 5

Percent of High School Classrooms in Which the Six Steps, Direct Instruction, Good Use of Time, and Implementation of TEA Strategies Were Reportedly Observed in Each Subdistrict

	Subdistrict									
	I		II		III		Magnet		Total	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Find	43	61	22	49	32	24	*	42	31	38
Tell	69	73	50	56	43	31	*	58	50	51
Demonstrate	81	76	57	77	69	66	*	48	67	68
Guided Practice	70	69	52	63	69	55	*	62	64	60
Application	45	45	29	42	44	24	*	41	39	34
Evaluation	40	49	35	38	37	24	*	39	40	43
Direct Instruction	89	97	82	77	82	78	100	68	88	79
Use of Time	93	93	84	79	85	78	97	72	89	80
TEA Strategies	88	88	58	56	87	72	100	90	85	73
N	89	74	141	117	237	232	217	69	690	492

*No numbers were reported.

In the spring Subdistricts II, III, and the magnets all reported smaller percentages of classrooms in which direct instruction, effective use of allocated instructional time, and documentation of implementation of TEA (SIP) strategies were found. In Subdistrict I the already high percentages either stayed the same or increased. The decline on these items reported in the magnets is of particular concern since monitors observed all or virtually all magnet school classrooms in the fall and a sample of these same classrooms in the spring. If the fall percentages are indeed correct, then dramatic declines occured in direct instruction and effective use of allocated instructional time over the course of the year; of the subdistricts the magnets reported the highest percentages on these items in the fall and the lowest percentages in the spring.

High schools reported evaluating the implementation of their strategies in basically the same ways that elementary and middle schools used. Classroom observation was used in most high schools, lesson plans were checked in approximately two-thirds of the high schools, and department or team meetings were used somewhat less often. A variety of other techniques were mentioned. Attempts at improving teacher attendance were reported in all schools.

Conclusions

Based on the results of the 1982-83 monitoring process, it was apparent that a number of improvements were warranted. For example, the monitoring form required revisions so that all items would produce quantifiable results. It was apparent that there was a need for more detailed and extended training of the monitors in understanding the meaning of items on the form and in completing the forms accurately.

The substantial variation in the numbers of teachers visited in each school, particularly at the secondary level, indicated a need for some agreement to be reached concerning a minimum number of teachers that each monitor would observe. Further agreement was needed on a minimum amount of time a monitor should remain in a classroom.

The data also revealed the need for some consensus on the importance of monitoring versus other commitments. Some personnel were viewing monitoring as an extra task that was not part of their normal job. Some personnel were apparently placing such a low priority on their monitoring assignments that they did not complete them. There seemed to be a need for guidelines for prioritizing commitments, making up missed monitoring visits, and delegating assigned monitoring responsibilities to other people.

The final problems concerned insuring the accuracy of the data on monitoring reports. Several team reports indicated that evidence or documentation was found in all observed classes yet individual monitor's reports, from which the team reports were compiled, showed that such evidence was not found in all classes. As a subdistrict administrator's responsibility, this task must be emphasized with respect to accuracy. Finally more standardization must be added with respect to several items on the form such as the need for observation rather than written documentation of SIP strategies being implemented.

The Aftermath

While a section entitled aftermath is not an orthodox part of a paper such as this, the authors felt it necessary since there has been a full half year of implementation and monitoring of school improvement plans for the 1983-84 school year.

During the summer of 1983, the monitoring forms underwent extensive revision. Appendix D contains a set of the elementary school forms. All items were designed to produce quantifiable results. Many of the items were made more specific. For example, there is a way to indicate that strategies were observed or that there was documentation other than observation that the strategies are implemented.

In September, all monitors were required to attend one of two half-day training sessions. At this time guidelines on the monitoring process were presented. Monitors were told that they must visit a minimum of four classrooms in each school unless the school is so small that there are not enough teachers for each team member to monitor four. Teachers were not to be "double monitored." In larger schools, a monitor may have to visit more than four teachers if the subdistrict administrator schedules more. Formal classroom observations were to be a minimum of thirty minutes. Shorter observations could be made but were not to be aggregated into the school and team reports or counted as one of the four visits. During training, the Deputy Superintendent clarified the priority nature of monitoring and informed all monitors that that was an essential part of their jobs. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction assigned not only the Directors as monitors as they had in the past, but also the coordinators and specialists. This made it possible for each elementary school subdistrict administrator to have three C&I monitors on their teams and each secondary administrator to have five C&I monitors. These monitors were parceled out among the 14 schools for which each administrator was responsible in a way that allowed maximum visitation but kept the number of schools a C&I person had to monitor to approximately five.

All of the subdistricts decided to conduct the monitoring process in teams. That is, all monitors were scheduled to visit a given school on a specified date. In addition, the subdistrict assistant superintendents agreed that they would monitor a minimum of two schools per subdistrict administrator for a total of eight each.

The training workshop emphasized accuracy in completing monitoring forms and the team reports. A preliminary look at data from the fall round of monitoring suggests that there is still room for improvement in this area.

Educational Importance

It has been the experience of the DISD that school improvement planning will fail without the added steps of implementation and monitoring. The best written plan gathering dust on the teacher's desk will not improve student achievement. Furthermore, the DISD has learned that implementation is in fact everyone's task. Finally, monitoring is necessary in order to insure that implementation occurs. This process, too, must become one of total staff involvement. It is hoped that the process described in this paper will help other districts take the steps beyond planning to implementation and monitoring which do in in fact result in increases in student achievement. It did in the Dallas Independent School District.

TEA ACCREDITATION GOAL 3

GOAL 3: WRITING

Students should have knowledge of the basic language arts skills in the early elementary grades along with more advanced courses in the upper grades.

INSTRUCTIONAL FOCI *What is to be learned?*	DOCUMENTATION/LOCATION *How do we know and how will someone else know we've accomplished what we said we are going to accomplish?*	TIME FRAME *How often will we do it?*	RESPONSIBILITY *Who is going to do it?*
• To improve punctuation, grammar, capitalization, and usage • To improve writing	• Teachers' daily lesson plans citing assignment or skill to be improved and strategy • Models of writing • Students' writing samples • School wide displays, classroom displays • Observe teaching in classrooms	• Strategies 1, 2 & 3: Every Wednesday from 8:15 to 8:30 a.m. at the appropriate grade level *. Strategy 4: Every Friday from 8:15 to 8:30 a.m.	• All teachers (K-1 will be oral language experinece)

*Note. While this appears to violate a directive not to have more than three strategies, it does not do so in reality. No single teacher would be responsible for more than 3 strategies because these are focused on grade levels for practical purposes.

STRATEGIES

How are we going to accomplish what we said we were going to accomplish?

STRATEGY 2 Paragraph Writing (Grades 2-3)

1. The teacher will find out what skills students have by providing initial opportunities for writing.

2. The teacher will determine the purpose of the writing the students will be doing and select a topic. The teacher will tell the students the purpose for the writing (describing something, persuading, writing letters, etc.).

3. Demonstrate/Teach as Follows:

   a. The teacher will write a topic sentence on the chalkboard or overhead.
   b. The teacher will ask students to give individual sentences which might be written about the topic.
   c. The teacher writes these sentences using correct handwriting, grammar, and spelling.
   d. The teacher has students read the paragraph.
   e. The teacher points out correct punctuation.

4. The teacher has students individually write the paragraph the class has written together (this is the day's handwriting practice). The students write whatever has been assigned with the teacher monitoring the writing process.

5. After some level of skill has been developed, the teacher will set a purpose for writing on a selected topic and ask students to write the paragraph as homework.

6. All paragraphs will be corrected and rewritten if necessary. Samples will be kept to show progress.

Appendix B

INTERNAL MONITORING SYSTEM

The XYZ School Administrative team will implement the following plan and use the attached instruments as a part of the internal monitoring process of the TEA School Improvement Plan. Note that the plan indicates that each teacher will be formally observed a minimum of five times per year.

1. Classroom visitations will be made using the "Classroom Observation Checklist/Feedback" sheet. Each teacher will be visited a minimum of one time each six weeks beginning with the second six weeks. A schedule of the visitations planned and completed will be maintained in the office.

   "Employee Performance Review" forms will be completed a minimum of once per year for teacher evaluation purposes, OR when a classroom observation dictates the necessity for an additional use of the form.

   Conferences will be held when the observations indicate it is necessary. A record of such conferences will also be maintained in the office.

2. Classroom visitations will also be made using the "School Improvement Plan Monitoring Form 1984-85, Classroom Observation" form. Each teacher will be monitored a minimum of twice per semester with the form. A schedule of planned and completed visits will be maintained in the office. Records of conferences will also be maintained.

3. Weekly team leader meetings with the administrators will be held to discuss instructional concerns and progress on implementing school improvement strategies as well as progress toward students mastering the priority skills.

4. Lesson plans will be reviewed weekly by the principal. Notations will be made when elements like the school improvement strategies, the learner standards, and others are missing or inadequate.

XYZ SCHOOL
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION CHECKLIST/FEEDBACK

Teacher: _____

Six Steps Observed	Yes	Not Evident	Did Not Observe	Comments
FIND				
TELL				
DEMONSTRATE				
GUIDED PRACTICE				
INDEPENDENT PRACTICE				
EVALUATION				
Student Behaviors Observed				
ATTENTIVE				
INSTRUCTIONALLY ENGAGED				
APPROPRIATE BEHAVIOR DISPLAYED				
ON TASK (95% OF PERIOD) (Observation Cycle)				
Teacher Behaviors Observed				
UTILIZING DIRECT TEACHING STRATEGIES				
MOTIVATION/REINFORCEMENT STRATEGIES UTILIZED				
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT SKILLS EVIDENT				
EFFECTIVE USE OF MATERIAL RESOURCES				
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS OBSERVED				
INSTRUCTIONAL VISUALS EVIDENT				
ROOM ARRANGEMENT FACILITATIVE				
CLASS RULES POSTED				
COURSE/LEARNING EXPECTATIONS POSTED				

General Comments:

Observer: _____ _____ _____
XYZ School Administrator Date Period

Appendix C

School Improvement Plan Monitoring Form 1982-83
Classroom Observation

(1) USED BY MONITOR FOR RECORDING A SINGLE CLASSROOM OBSERVATION. THERE WILL BE ONE PER CLASSROOM VISITED.

School	Principal	Date of Visit
Teacher	Content/Subject Observed	Grade Level Observed

FIND . . . about skill/content/objective to be learned (Total _____)

Teacher:
___ asking questions
___ administering formal test

Students:
___ answering questions
___ writing or orally answering formal test

TELL . . . what skill/content/objective will be learned and why (Total _____)

Teacher:
___ telling
___ periodically referencing
___ writing on board, overhead, chart
___ monitoring work
___ reminding

Students:
___ told me

DEMONSTRATE . . . the skill/content/objective to be learned (Total _____)

Teacher:
___ explaining w/chalkboard, chart, or overhead
___ giving examples
___ illustrating w/visual aids
___ directing choral response
___ calling on individual students
___ asking questions

Students:
___ reading orally while others follow text
___ answering questions
___ writing from dictation, chalkboard, overhead, or chart
___ listening to teacher model, explain, illustrate
___ responding chorally
___ responding individually while others listen

GUIDED PRACTICE . . . on the skill/content/objective to be learned (Total _____)

Teacher:
___ asking question
___ directing students to practice in other ways
___ providing practice materials
___ giving immediate feedback
___ moving among students w/feedback

Students:
___ responding orally
___ writing answers to questions
___ daily written activity as teacher moves among them

APPLICATION . . . of the skill/content/objective to be learned (Total _____)

Teacher:
___ giving homework assignment
___ asking questions about application
___ going over homework assignment

Students:
___ using available responses to apply
___ telling teacher how they might apply
___ working on homework

EVALUATION ... of the skill/content/objective to be learned (Total _____)

Teacher:
___ administering oral or written test
___ informally quizzing
___ correcting and grading papers

Students:
___ writing formal test
___ responding orally to question
___ writing paragraph, producing art, performing skill, etc.

1. Was this lesson a TEA Accreditation strategy? ___ Yes ___ No

2. Was there documentation of District-wide Thrust 2 (use of allocated instruction time)?

___ Observation
___ Lesson plans
___ Tests, quizzes, reports
___ Teacher clearly defining learner expectations
___ Weekly, bi-weekly, other assessments
___ Immediate correctives

3. List what was included in lesson plans.

4. In this classroom was there evidence of direct instruction?
___ Yes ___ No Comment:

School Improvement Plan Monitoring Form 1982-83
School Monitoring Report Form

(2) USED BY MONITOR TO COMPILE RESULTS OF CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS FOR ONE SCHOOL. THERE WILL BE ONE PER SCHOOL PER MONITOR.

_____ School _____ Principal _____ Date of Visit

Number of teachers visited and content/subject by grade level

Grade Level	Number	Language Arts	Math	Reading	Social Studies	Science	Others
K	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
1	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
2	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
3	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
4	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
5	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
6	____	____	____	____	____	____	____

1. In how many of the classes observed did you see:

(a) FIND ____ (c) DEMONSTRATE ____ (e) APPLY ____

(b) TELL ____ (d) GUIDED PRACTICE ____ (f) EVALUATE ____

2. There was evidence of direct instruction:

_____ in all classes in _____ of _____ classes.

3. Documentation of TEA strategies being implemented was found:

_____ in all classes in _____ of _____ classes.

4. Documentation that District-wide Thrust 2 (use of total allocated instruction time) was being implemented was found:

_____ in all classes in _____ of _____ classes

5. Lesson plans contained the following common factors:

_____ in all classes in _____ of _____ classes.

_____

_____

_____

6. Does this school have a provision for evaluating the strategies and if so, how?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Did you debrief with the principal? _____ Yes _____ No

If not, why not? _____

If yes, what major points were made by each?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Was there documentation that District-wide Thrust 1 (improve teacher attendance) was being implemented?

_____ Yes _____ No

9. Comments, suggestions, commendations, recommendations, actions required:

School Improvement Plan Monitoring Form
Monitoring Team Report Form

(3) USED BY TEAM TO COMPILE RESULTS OF EACH TEAM MEMBER'S VISIT TO A SCHOOL. THERE WILL BE ONE PER SCHOOL PER TEAM.

School	Principal	Principal's Signature
Monitor's Signature & Date of Visit	Monitor's Signature & Date of Visit	Monitor's Signature & Date of Visit

Combined total of teachers visited without repetition

Grade Level	Number	Language Arts	Math	Reading	Social Studies	Science	Others
K							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							

1. In how many of the classes observed did you see:
   (a) FIND _____ (c) DEMONSTRATE _____ (e) APPLY _____
   (b) TELL _____ (d) GUIDED PRACTICE _____ (f) EVALUATE _____

2. There was evidence of direct instruction:
   _____ in all classes in _____ of _____ classes.

3. Documentation of TEA strategies being implemented was found:
   _____ in all classes in _____ of _____ classes.

4. Documentation that District-wide Thrust 2 (use of total allocated instruction time) was being implemented was found:
   _____ in all classes in _____ of _____ classes.

5. Lesson plans contained the following common factors:
   _____ in all classes in _____ of _____ classes.
   _____
   _____

6. Does this school have a provision for evaluating the strategies and if so, how?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. What major points were made to the principal concerning the visit when monitor(s) debriefed?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Was there documentation that District-wide Thrust 1 (increase teacher attendance) was being implemented?

_____ Yes _____ No

9. Comments, suggestions, commendations, recommendations, actions required:

Appendix D

REVISED 1-84

School Improvement Plan Monitoring Form 1983-84
Classroom Observation

(1) USED BY MONITOR FOR RECORDING A SINGLE CLASSROOM OBSERVATION. THERE WILL BE ONE PER CLASSROOM VISITED.

School	Principal	Date of Visit	Monitor's Name

Teacher	Content/Subject Observed	Grade Level	Special Program

1. FIND. . . . . out what students already know/remember about the skill/content/objective to be learned. Yes | No

TELL. . . . . the students what skill/content/objective will be learned/reviewed and why. Yes | No

DEMONSTRATE . . . . the skill/content/objectives to be learned. Yes | No

Teacher behavior may include: (1) explaining w/chalkboard, chart, or overhead, (2) giving examples, (3) illustrating with visual aids, (4) directing choral responses, (5) asking questions.

Student behavior may include: (1) reading orally while others follow text, (2) answering questions, (3) writing from dictation, chalkboard, overhead, or chart, (4) listening to teacher model, explain, illustrate, (5) responding chorally.

GUIDED PRACTICE . . on the skill/content/objective to be learned. Yes | No

Teacher behavior may include: (1) asking questions, (2) directing as students practice in other ways, (3) providing practice materials, (4) giving immediate feedback, (5) movin, among students with feedback.

Student behavior may include: (1) answering questions orally or in writing, (2) writing as teacher moves among them, (3) reading silently for a purpose already explained.

APPLY . . . . . the skill/content/objective to be learned. Yes | No

Teacher gives homework or seatwork assignment which students do independently.

EVALUATE. . . . . the skill/content/objective to be learned. Yes | No

This is a formal or informal assessment of the lesson which should result in a decision about the next steps the teacher will take relative to the skill/content/objective to be learned.

2. What evidence existed that school improvement plan strategies are implemented in this classroom?

___ Strategies cited in lesson plan
___ Observed use of strategy
___ Current student work reflecting strategy
___ Current teacher preparations/materials for strategy

3. Which strategies were observed in this classroom?

		GOAL						
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
STRATEGY	1							
	2							
	3							

4. What was included in the lesson plans?

___ Did not request
___ Did not exist/not available
___ Baseline objective(s)/Learner standards
___ School improvement plan strategies
___ Date(s)
___ Instructional activities
___ Resources/materials
___ Means of evaluation
___ All subject areas/preparations
___ Year

The lesson observed matched the lesson plan Yes | No

5. In general this teacher exhibited behaviors which characterize

___ Direct instruction ___ Assignment giving ___ Other (explain)

Over

6. The instruction observed was directed to:

___ The entire class ___ A majority of the students ___ Small groups

7. There was "GUIDED PRACTICE" in this classroom.

___ Yes ___ No

8. The classroom physical environment may be described by the following:

___ Current student work displayed
___ Content-related material displayed
___ Too much material present in classroom, i.e. cluttered
___ Functional arrangement of furniture
___ Clean room (no paper on floor, etc.)

9. The classroom climate may be described by the following:

___ Students actively participating/attentive
___ Discipline problems at a minimum
___ Positive reinforcement observed
___ Teacher spread questions around among students
___ Teacher appeared enthusiastic and motivated
___ Overall, the climate seemed conducive to learning
___ Overall, the climate did not appear conducive to learning

10. The use of allocated instructional time may be described by the following:

___ Class began promptly
___ There was a culminating activity
___ Class time was spent on instruction not on homework, extracurricular activities, etc.
___ Transitions between lessons or subject areas were accomplished quickly
___ Overall, there appeared to be good use of total allocated instruction time
___ Overall, instruction time was not used well

11. If this is a Programmatic Remedies classroom, describe briefly your overall impression of the effectiveness of instruction for these students.

School Improvement Plan Monitoring Form 1983-84
School Monitoring Report Form

REVISED 1-84

(2) USED BY MONITOR TO COMPILE RESULTS OF CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS FOR ONE SCHOOL. THERE WILL BE ONE PER SCHOOL PER MONITOR.

School _____ Principal _____ Date of Visit _____ Monitor's Name _____

Number of teachers visited and content/subject by grade level

Grade Level	No.Bil. or ESL	Language Arts	Math	Reading	Social Studies	Science	Phys. Ed.	Other	Programmatic Remedies	Total Number
K	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
1	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
2	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
3	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
4	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
5	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
6	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Multi-age	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Special Ed.		____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Chapter 1		____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Media Center										____

1. In how many of the classes observed did you see:

   (a) FIND ____ (c) DEMONSTRATE ____ (e) APPLY ____

   (b) TELL ____ (d) GUIDED PRACTICE ____ (f) EVALUATE ____

2. In how many of the classes observed did you see evidence that the School Improvement Plan strategies were being implemented in the following ways:

   ___ Strategies cited in lesson plans
   ___ Observed use of strategies
   ___ Current student work reflecting strategies
   ___ Current teacher preparation/ materials for strategies

3. Which strategies did you observe being used by teachers in this school?

		GOAL						
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
STRATEGY	1							
	2							
	3							

4. How many times was each of the following included in lesson plans?

   ___ Did not request
   ___ Did not exist/Not available
   ___ Baseline objectives/Learner standards
   ___ School Improvement Plan strategies
   ___ Date(s)
   ___ Instructional activities
   ___ Resources/Materials
   ___ Means of evaluation
   ___ All subject areas/preparations
   ___ Year

   The lessons observed matched the lesson plans in ____ classrooms.

5. How many teachers exhibited behaviors which characterized:

   ___ Direct instruction ___ Assignment giving ___ Other(Explain)

6. In how many classes observed was instruction directed to:

   ___ The entire class
   ___ The majority of the students
   ___ Small groups

7. There was "Unguided Practice" observed in ___ (number) of classrooms.

8. In how many classrooms could the physical environment be described by the following:

   Current student work displayed ___ Functional arrangement of

37 BEST COPY

9. In how many classrooms could the classroom climate be described by the following:

___ Students actively participating/ attentive
___ Discipline problems at a minimum
___ Positive reinforcement observed
___ Teacher spread questions around among students
___ Teacher appeared enthusiastic and motivated
___ Overall, the climate seemed conducive to learning
___ Overall, the climate did not appear conducive to learning

10. In how many classrooms could the use of allocated instruction time be described by the following:

___ Class began promptly
___ There was a culminating activity
___ Class time was spent on instruction not on homework, extracurricula activities, etc.
___ Transitions between lessons or subject areas were accomplished quickly
___ Overall, there appeared to be good use of total allocated instruction time
___ Overall, instruction time was not used well

11. Briefly describe your impression of the overall effectiveness of the Programmatic Remedies classes you observed.

12. Is there evidence that the internal monitoring system is being implemented? ___ Yes ___ No

13. Did you debrief with the principal? ___ Yes ___ No

14. Comments, suggestions, commendations, recommendations, action required:

BEST COPY

School Improvement Plan Monitoring Form 1983-84
Monitoring Team Report Form

REVISED 1-84

(3) USED BY TEAM TO COMPILE RESULTS OF EACH TEAM MEMBER'S VISIT TO A SCHOOL. THERE WILL BE ONE PER SCHOOL PER TEAM.

_____ School _____ Principal _____ Principal's Signature

Monitors' Signatures and Dates of Visits:

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

Combined total of teachers visited without repetition

Grade Level	No.Bil. or ESL	Language Arts	Math	Reading	Social Studies	Science	Phys. Ed.	Other	Programmatic Remedies	Total Number
K	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
1	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
2	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
3	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
4	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
5	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
6	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Multi-age	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Special Ed.		____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Chapter 1		____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
Media Center										____

1. In how many of the classes observed did you see:

   (a) FIND ____ (c) DEMONSTRATE ____ (e) APPLY ____

   (b) TELL ____ (d) GUIDED PRACTICE ____ (f) EVALUATE ____

2. In how many of the classes observed did you see evidence that the School Improvement Plan strategies were being implemented in the following ways:

   ___ Strategies cited in lesson plans
   ___ Observed strategies used
   ___ Current student work reflecting strategies
   ___ Current teacher preparation/ materials for strategies

3. Which strategies were observed in this school?

		GOAL						
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
STRATEGY	1							
	2							
	3							

4. How many times was each of the following included in lesson plans?

   ___ Did not request
   ___ Did not exist/Not available
   ___ Baseline objectives/Learner standards
   ___ School Improvement Plan strategies
   ___ Date(s)
   ___ Instructional activities
   ___ Resources/Materials
   ___ Means of evaluation
   ___ All subject areas/preparations
   ___ Year

   The lessons observed matched the lesson plans in ____ classrooms.

5. How many teachers exhibited behaviors which characterized:

   ___ Direct instruction ___ Assignment giving ___ Other (Explain)

6. In how many classes observed was instruction directed to:

   ___ The entire class
   ___ The majority of the students
   ___ Small groups

BEST COPY

7. There was "Unguided Practice" observed in ___ (number) of classrooms.

8. In how many classrooms could the physical environment be described by the following:

___ Current student work displayed
___ Content-related material displayed
___ Too much material present in classroom
___ Functional arrangement of furniture
___ No paper, etc. on floor

9. In how many classrooms could the classroom climate be described by the following:

___ Students actively participating/attentive
___ Discipline problems at a minimum
___ Positive reinforcement observed
___ Teacher spread questions around among students
___ Teacher appeared enthusiastic and motivated
___ Overall, the climate seemed conducive to learning
___ Overall, the climate did not appear conducive to learning

10. In how many classrooms could the use of allocated instruction time be described by the following:

___ Class began promptly
___ There was a culminating activity
___ Class time was spent on instruction not on homework, extracurricula activities, etc.
___ Transitions between lessons or subject areas were accomplished quickly
___ Overall, there appeared to be good use of total allocated instruction time
___ Overall, instruction time was not used well

11. Is there evidence that Programmatic Remedies are being implemented?
___ Yes ___ No

12. Briefly describe the overall impression of the effectiveness of the instruction in the Programmatic Remedies classrooms.

13. Is there evidence that the internal monitoring system is being implemented?
___ Yes ___ No

14. Comments, suggestions, commendations, recommendations, action required:

BEST COPY